



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,014	10/06/2000	Paul Bilibin	PSTM0023/MRK	9818
29524	7590	02/18/2004	EXAMINER	
KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, A.L.C. 140 S. LAKE., SUITE 312 PASADENA, CA 91101-4710			JEANTY, ROMAIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	
DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/684,014

Applicant(s) **SW**

BILIBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Romain Jeanty

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 and 7-9 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3623

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Non-final Office action is in response to the filing of this application on October 6 2000. Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dialog (A 'Blue Chip' Mailroom Investment.) in view of Pintsov (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,416).

As per claim1, Dialog discloses a self-service postal system comprising:

determine for each of a plurality of users upon input by each user of a particular origin postal code and a particular destination postal code an origin rating zone identifier corresponding to the particular origin postal code for each of a plurality of carriers( a user inputting a package identification number using a hand-held portable entry at a remote station, a courier code and an a destination identifier). Note pages 1 and 2. Dialog does not explicitly disclose a destination rating zone identifier corresponding to the particular destination postal code for each of the plurality of carriers. Pintsov in the same field of endeavor, discloses a mail generation system comprising a mail rating parameter such as postal zone (col. 4, lines 18-30). Pintsov further discloses the use of Local Area Network (Internet) for user communication which is equivalent to "wherein each user accesses the shipping management computer system over a global communications network using a client computer device, and wherein each user client computer

Art Unit: 3623

device has an individual electronic connection to the global communications network” (col. 7, lines 3-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teachings of Dialog to incorporate the rating zone parameters as evidenced by Pintsov. Doing so would improve flexibility for the mailer in creating mail and a high level of security for payment and evidencing of appropriate carrier service.

As per claim 2, Dialog further discloses calculating for each of the plurality of users upon each request by each user a preview shipping rate for each of a plurality of services offered by each of the plurality of carriers for shipping a particular parcel according to a set of parcel characteristics shipping rules for the particular carrier and according to a set of pricing rules for each particular service offered by the particular carrier as applied to a set of parcel specifications for the particular parcel input by the particular user and as applied to the origin rating zone identifier and the destination rating zone identifier (the computer for calculating shipping cost using the destination and carrier codes). Note page 2, paragraph 1.

With regard to claim 3, all of its limitations are parallel to the limitations of claim 1 and is therefore analyzed based on the same rationale.

With regard to claim 4, all of its limitations are parallel to the limitations of claim 2 and is therefore analyzed based on the same rationale.

With regard to claim 5, all of its limitations are parallel to the limitations of claim 1 and is therefore analyzed based on the same rationale.

With regard to claim 6, all of its limitations are parallel to the limitations of claim 2 and is therefore analyzed based on the same rationale.

### **Conclusion**

Art Unit: 3623

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Cordery et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,781,634) discloses a method for preparing mailpieces.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (703) 308-9585. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are not successful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R Hafiz can be reached at (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (703) 305-7687

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington VA, Seventh floor receptionist.



Romain Jeanty

Primary Examiner

December 14, 2003